



David Brown
and
Ian Wilson

Ethnicized Violence in Indonesia: The Betawi Brotherhood Forum in Jakarta

Working Paper No.145

July 2007

The views presented in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect those of the Asia Research Centre or Murdoch University. Working papers are considered draft publications for critical comments by colleagues and will generally be expected to be published elsewhere in a more polished form after a period of critical engagement and revision. Comments on papers should be directed to the author(s) at d.brown@murdoch.edu.au or i.wilson@murdoch.edu.au

A revised version of this paper is published in *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 13 (3), July 2007: 367-403

© Copyright is held by the author(s) of each working paper: No part of this publication may be republished, reprinted or reproduced in any form without the permission of the paper's author(s).

National Library of Australia.
ISSN: 1037-4612



Abstract

Ethnic gang violence is often depicted as a clash between criminals pursuing instrumental advantage, and also as a clash of ideological fanatics pursuing collective nationalist, ethnolinguistic or ethnoreligious rights. However, there is an apparent tension between the conceptualization of such violence as the rational self-interest of deprived individuals, and as the irrational fanaticism of anomic communities. The examination of one particular ethnic gang, the Betawi Brotherhood Forum which operates in Jakarta, Indonesia, indicates how both dimensions of violence coexist and interweave. The apparent analytical tension between individualistic pragmatism and collectivist moral absolutism is resolved by showing how the gang responds to their disillusionment with the state by constructing for themselves a 'state proxy' role. This response is portrayed as based upon 'ressentiment' – the 'faulty rationality' which marginalized individuals adopt so as to translate their clashes of material self interests into the moral conflict between stereotyped communities- the virtuous ethnic Us against the demonized ethnic Other.

Key words: ethnic conflict; political violence; Islam; gang.

The global incidence of violence between members of different linguistic, racial or religious groups (ethnicized violence¹), has prompted various attempts at explanation. This paper looks at one site of such violence, involving the gang fighting which has intensified in Indonesia since the fall of Suharto in 1998. Such violence has become rampant in various urban areas of Indonesia, with gangs armed with machetes attacking property, each other, and members of 'victim' communities, resulting in numerous deaths. The focus here is on one gang in Indonesia, the Betawi Brotherhood Forum (FBR) of Jakarta, whose members are impelled to violence by the belief that their individual self-aggrandizement constitutes a collectivist ethnic right. It is this interplay between instrumentalism and ideology which constitutes the focus of the paper.²

There have been numerous studies of ethnicized violence in post-Suharto Indonesia, focusing on various sites of conflict, notably the separatist disputes in East Timor, Aceh and West Papua, Muslim-Christian rioting in the Moluccas and Sulawesi, inter-ethnic violence in Kalimantan, anti-Chinese violence, and the violent behavior of Muslim paramilitary groups and youth gangs.³ These studies vary as to their depictions of ethnicized violence. Some have focused primarily on its cultural and historical roots; some on the role of economic disparities; and others on the political role of the state as the agency of patrimonial or coercive oppression.⁴ Several such studies have noted that New Order actors have continued to play a role in promoting violence towards targets identified in part on an ethnic basis.⁵

While descriptive studies often incorporate diverse approaches, there has nevertheless been a recent trend towards emphasizing the instrumentalist basis for violence, seeing it as arising primarily from the pragmatic struggle for material resources, with the analysis often focusing upon the manipulative behavior of political and economic elites.⁶ When, however, attention has focused on the motives of followers, analysis often shifts to the mobilization of communal loyalties portrayed more as cultural givens than as rational choices.⁷

This literature on ethnicized violence in Indonesia aims primarily to offer rich descriptions of particular cases rather than to apply or develop particular theories,⁸ so that the conceptual relationship between these two aspects of violence- as a clash of material self-interests and as a clash of communal loyalties - is rarely carefully examined. If ethnicized violence were to be depicted as an attempt to resolve material deprivation, then the perpetrators could be portrayed as egoistic criminals motivated

to group violence through a pragmatic and instrumentally rational calculation to maximize their access to scarce resources. If, on the other hand, the violence were seen to arise out of an irrational retreat from anomic dislocations into absolutist loyalties to cultural communities, then the perpetrators could be depicted as ideological fanatics. However, the intermixing of these two facets of violence in the accounts offered by many descriptive studies, is made conceptually problematical by the polarities employed to construct the two divergent depictions – deprivation or dislocation, individualistic or collectivist, rational or irrational, amoral or moralistic, pragmatic or ideological. The question arises as to how one is to explain the intermixing of these two types of factor and motivation, in the same situation, the same gang, or even the same individual.

The explanation which follows relates to one case of ethnic gang violence, and it is recognized that the interplay of instrumental and ideological elements might differ in cases of ethnic riots or ethnic separatism. Nevertheless, this study has broad applicability in illuminating contemporary debate between the two strands of argument. The purpose is to indicate how the two causal factors (deprivation and dislocation) might derive from a common situation; and how the two characterizations of the perpetrators (as pragmatic criminal and as ideological fanatic) might constitute compatible manifestations of a common response to that situation. The argument developed here, is that the two facets of ethnicized violence derive from particular forms of disillusionment with the state, and from a ‘faulty rationality’ response to that disillusionment.

Aspects of ethnicized violence in post-Suharto Indonesia:

(a) Violence as instrumental pragmatism

Violence has frequently been explained as arising out of “rational quarrels over the distribution of resources”.⁹ In Indonesia, the state under Suharto functioned as the patrimonial center of a patron-client network, distributing patronage to clients in return for their political support. Access to resources thus depended significantly upon personalized relationships, extending ‘from village to palace’, through which clients could hope to ‘buy’ resources in return for their loyalty to individual patrons linked to the various arms and levels of the state, who could then employ this loyalty to advantage in their elite rivalries. The fact that this personalistic and patrimonial system relied upon corruption and nepotism meant that the resultant distribution of

resources was never effectively institutionalized, and left various sections of society exploited or marginalized. It thus did not provide a very effective basis for Indonesia's political integration. Nevertheless, it retained some stability and predictability so long as Suharto's New Order regime functioned as the focal source of patronage. The fall of Suharto, the weak governments that followed, and the chaotic implementation of administrative decentralization measures, all contributed to the disruption of patron-client linkages, and thence to increased unpredictability in the contention for resources. Marginalized groups sought new patronage openings from the 'fiefdoms' which emerged at various levels of the bureaucracy. When resource deprivations were intensified by Indonesia's post-1997 economic slump, and when economic disparities were further exacerbated by neo-liberal policies, various groups in Indonesia began to experience downward social mobility and material deprivation. Contention for patronage thus became increasingly predatory, unpredictable and violent.¹⁰

Those patronage networks that had hitherto relied on access to state resources, but now found themselves marginalized or excluded, began to seek new means to access resources.¹¹ Those who had recourse to egoistic criminality in order to access scarce resources, sometimes found it advantageous to organize into ethnic gangs, so as to generate resources through theft, or through 'protection racket' violence.¹² Such ethnic gangs were essentially instrumentalist groupings whose shared cultural norms and territorial contiguity facilitated their development as interactive socio-economic networks. Ethnicized violence could thus be seen as a rational response by those suffering material deprivation, where the state had weakened in the sense of failing to provide effective channels of access to patronage resources. In Jacques Bertrand's recent study, for example, he explains ethnic violence in Indonesia as arising from the ways in which state institutions have favored some ethnic groups over others, thus generating grievances relating to economic discrimination or disadvantage, denial of political rights or representation, or cultural discrimination. "Whether grievances are based on economic, political, or cultural conditions and comparisons, the likelihood of violence increases when significant changes lead to worsened conditions for disadvantaged groups or offer potential threats to the privileged status of dominant groups".¹³

(b) Violence as ethnic absolutism

Violence is sometimes depicted as arising from an upsurge of anger or aggression that has its origin, not in material deprivation, but in a feeling of powerlessness, alienation or humiliation. Such feelings might in some cases accompany material deprivation, but might arise independently, and are analytically distinct. This can provide a basis for explaining ethnicized violence when the feelings of powerlessness are seen to derive from the type of social conditions denoted by Durkheim as ‘anomic’ – situations in which social dislocation coincides with the development of a dissonance between the moral norms of equal citizenship embodied in public discourse, and the barriers to social mobility embodied in day-to-day experience. As Liah Greenfeld has recently explained, it is particularly the dissonance between the promises offered in the language of civic nationalism, of equal citizenship and popular sovereignty; and the social realities of entrenched civic impotence and inequity, which generate anomie.¹⁴

This might trigger various responses, including a retreat into apathetic loss of will, or outbursts of social deviance; but one possibility which is frequently alluded to in the literature on ethnic conflict, is that it triggers a ‘crisis of identity’ which leads individuals under stress to ‘revert’ to an instinctual identification with ‘the primordial tribe’. Instead of individual identity being experienced as multiple affiliations with diverse ethnic or other collectivities, security is sought in intensified ‘herd conformity’ with a single community of cultural sameness; and in a belief in the moral certainties of its collective values. As Huntington put it in his discussion of the cultural and religious resurgence underlying the global ‘clash of civilizations’, “modernization generates feelings of alienation and anomie as traditional bonds and social relations are broken, and leads to crises of identity to which religion provides an answer.”¹⁵

In the Indonesian case, the anomie that might underlie ethnicized violence has several sources, including the dislocations of communities and authority structures associated with modernization and globalization. State interventions in society have also contributed to social disruptions both through the impact of political centralization and national integration policies, but also through the destabilizing impact upon diverse communities and patron-client networks, of governmental corruption, inefficiency, arbitrariness and instability. The resultant social discontent was manifested in the intense political mobilization of the post-1997 ‘reformasi’

period.¹⁶ The promises of political activists at that time, of an imminent transition to justice and good governance, clashed with the social realities of resurgent patrimonial corruption, entrenched civic impotence and social inequality. This anomic dissonance was endemic. As Max Lane quoted from a 1997 interview:

The urban poor... read the penny novels of Freddy S and the Chinese fighting stories of Wiro Sableng and Kho Ping Ho which teach of the holiness of pure love and that those who struggle for justice and truth are always victorious, always survive ... (They) are more aware of the contradictions around them because in their daily lives the rich pass back and forth before their very eyes. They experience all kinds of criminality, including the criminal actions of the government and the violence and arrogance of the military in the form of extortion, bribes and beatings.¹⁷

If some individuals do seek release from anomic dissonance by intensifying their identification with the ethnic community, the danger is clearly that the anomic insecurity is merely transferred from the individual to the ethnic collectivity; so that the ethnic community becomes the ‘bent twig’¹⁸ which lashes out violently to protect its formulaic collective rights. This is particularly likely when, as in Indonesia, the state has legitimated itself as the guarantor of inter-ethnic harmony, promising ‘unity in diversity’ but lacking the capacity to deliver such ethnic security. From this perspective, the fundamental cause of ethnic conflict in Indonesia would appear to be “an erosion of belief in the nation-state as the unquestioned given of modern politics” so that “people seek other sources of community” in “nationhood, ethnicity and religion”. Violence follows when such attachments become “a label separating Us from Them.”¹⁹

This sketch of the two strands of argument indicates their divergence. Both interpretations have been applied to the gangs and paramilitary-style groups which have proliferated in Indonesia in recent years. They have been widely portrayed as criminal gangs employing violence for purposes of extortion and intimidation, in the unprincipled pursuit of money, jobs or contracts. However they are also depicted as the vigilante arms of ethnic, religious or nationalist movements, imbued with absolutist notions of collective injustice and collective rights.²⁰ The apparent tension between these two facets of the gangs has most often been resolved by the assumption that the reality of self-interested pragmatic criminality is being camouflaged and manipulatively rationalized by the pretence of commitment to the moral ethnic or

religious community. Alternatively, the tension is sometimes resolved by depicting the gangs as organizations of ethnic or religious militants who seek their recruits from individualistic delinquents, in order to convert them into defenders of collectivist virtue, while sometimes failing in this conversion enterprise. They therefore have to repeatedly weed out unconverted 'rogue elements' (*oknum*).²¹ However, in order to decide whether both depictions can be coherently accommodated, we need to look more closely at the gangs.

INDONESIAN GANG VIOLENCE

Gang violence is not a new phenomenon in Indonesia. The local 'strong man', known under a variety of names such as *jago*, *jawara*, *bajingan* and more recently *preman* is the product of a widespread culture which emphasizes masculinity, martial arts and supernatural powers. Politically they have been central yet ambiguous figures throughout the history of the archipelago from the colonial period to the present.²² While to their local community the jawara ('champions') might be virtuous protectors and charismatic leaders, to others they were ruthless predators and bandits. In contemporary Indonesia the designation of jawara implies a link to traditional morality and martial prowess, whilst 'preman' implies criminality.²³ A pattern has continued throughout Indonesian history whereby rulers and power holders have maintained a symbiotic relationship with criminals and gangs, occasionally employing state violence against them, but also co-opting them.²⁴ Gangs of bandits and jawara, known as *gerombolan*, were central in the struggle against Dutch colonial rule, along with youths who joined irregular militias, known as *laskyar*.²⁵ These gangs and militias were recruited by the nationalists but often also pursued their own interests. After decolonization, some were recruited into the new Indonesian National Army, but many more found themselves with no recognition for their role in the revolution, and turned to make a living from extortion and kidnapping.

The beginning of Suharto's 'New Order' regime saw a situation similar to the post-revolution period. Youths who had been mobilized by the military against suspected communists and leftists during 1965-66 returned to everyday life to find themselves unemployed and with scant prospects. Criminal gangs soon threatened to undermine the new regime's claim that it was a restorer of political and social stability. The response by the New Order was a two-pronged strategy of cooptation and coercion. In 1973 General Soemitro, head of the Command for the Restoration of

Security and Public Order (*Kopkamtib*) ordered the disbanding of all “groups and gangs of teenagers.”²⁶ In the same year the state formed the Indonesian National Youth Committee (KNPI) as the sole forum for youth organizations in Indonesia. A sub-committee of this, the State Intelligence Agency (BAKIN) assembled former gang leaders for training as mechanics, and throughout the country local military commanders established various ‘teen clubs’ that usually emphasized sport.²⁷ The effect was to reconstruct ‘preman’ under the more palatable mantle of ‘youth’, and to mobilize them for the suppression of dissent and other ‘regime maintenance chores’.

But their subsequent elimination by the state was also central to the New Order’s construction of itself as the guardian of social and political security in the face of an ever-present threat of anarchy and lawlessness.²⁸ Periodic purges were directed primarily at petty criminals, who were summarily executed by government hit squads; as in the mysterious Petrus shootings of 1982-3 which resulted in several thousand deaths²⁹. The killings sent panic through the preman world, and resulted in many joining state-backed groups such as the Pancasila Youth (*Pemuda Pancasila*).

The end of the New Order was characterized by the unraveling of the strong centralized state, but not of the culture of violence and intimidation. Decentralization reforms first implemented in 1999 devolved political and fiscal power from Jakarta to the provinces and then to district and sub-district levels. One impact was the reinvigoration and politicization of localized ethnolinguistic and ethnoreligious identities, which could now be employed as a basis for seeking resource or status advancement. In 1999 Habibie revoked the New Order regulation of *asas tunggal* which had required all social and community organizations to adopt the state ideology of the *Pancasila* as their sole ideological foundation. The *asas tunggal* was an instrument which had allowed the New Order to suppress ethnic and religious organizations by depicting them as the *SARA* affiliations of tribe, religion, race and class (*suku, agama, ras antar golongan*) which threatened national unity. The lifting of the *asas tunggal* opened the flood gates for ethnic and religious groups and organizations which had felt aggrieved by the New Order’s suppression, and sought recompense.

In the social upheaval following Suharto’s resignations, the military encouraged the formation of *pamswkarsa* (self-help) civilian security forces, including largely Islamic vigilante and paramilitary groups that were mobilized in a failed attempt to curtail student demonstrations against President Habibie. While older

state-sponsored preman-based organizations such as the *Pemuda Pancasila* and *Pancamarga Youth (Pemuda Pancamarga)* continued to depict themselves as defenders of national unity, the new preman groups were organized almost exclusively along ‘post-Pancasila’ ethnic and religious lines. Many of these new gangs were thus not merely criminal youths seeking material benefits; they were also often marginalized ethnic communities seeking collective rights.³⁰ It seems likely that both facets of ethnicized violence can offer partial illuminations of these ethnicized gangs, but if this is so, how are we to conceptualize their intertwining?

THE BETAWI BROTHERHOOD FORUM

The Betawi Brotherhood Forum (FBR) first emerged in July 2001 in the wake of a series of violent incidents between Betawi and Maduranese in East Jakarta.³¹ Led by Fadloli el-Muhir, an Islamic preacher, a former journalist and a politician within the Indonesian Democratic Party (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia*, or *PDI*), the FBR claims to represent the interests of Jakarta’s ethnic Betawi, widely portrayed as the indigenous population of Jakarta.³² The Betawi comprise about 27% of Jakarta’s population, numbering about 2.7 million, and clustered primarily in Eastern and Central Jakarta.³³ The FBR is one of several Betawi organizations, but has been one of the most active and successful, both in membership terms, and in terms of the acquisition of power. In the words of the organization, its purpose is:

To act as a vehicle through which to struggle for the rights of the Betawi community, which till now have been oppressed, both structurally as well as culturally, so that they may become ‘the real owner of the island’³⁴

After the end of the New Order the number of Betawi organizations increased from 20 to over 70, most of which were affiliated with the umbrella association, the Betawi Consultative Body, (*Badan Musyawarah Betawi*, or *Bamus*).³⁵ The FBR distinguished itself from other Betawi organizations by its focus upon recruiting from amongst the urban poor and unemployed. This strategy has been very successful. Since FBR’s inception in 2001 its membership has grown to around 80-100,000, spread throughout the greater Jakarta area. Almost all of FBR’s members are males aged between 20 and 40 years old, 50% of whom are unemployed. The FBR thus proclaims itself as a voice for the most marginalized and disenfranchised Betawi. It initially rejected *Bamus* as an organization concerned only for “elite Betawi”.³⁶

According to the FBR, the Betawi have been oppressed in their own homeland, and have failed to benefit from either the economic development (*pembangunan*) of the New Order, or the process of democratization following its demise. FBR's answer is the assertion that only through predatory behavior will Betawi get ahead in society. In order to achieve their goal the FBR have undertaken a strategy of claiming their economic and political rights through the use of coercion, intimidation and force. The FBR is thus organized on quasi-military lines. Its extensive network of security posts (*gardu*) mirrors the army's territorial command structure. Uniforms and military-style insignia are used. It has various 'troops', with training in martial arts and techniques believed to confer supernatural powers. At the *gardu* security post level these troops are referred to as *Pitung*, and are under the command of a *pendekar*, a title derived from martial arts culture of *pencak silat*, who in turn is under the authority at the district level of the *jawara*, the highest title conferred within the organization.³⁷ The organizations ubiquitous slogan is the call "to become jawara in their own neighborhood".

Interviews with gang members, and observations of their activities, make it clear that belief in the wrongs done to the Betawi ethno-religious community, in the justice of its claims, and in the need to defend the homeland autonomy of the Betawi against those who would invade it, coexist with the concern of individual gang members to use violence and intimidation in order to enrich themselves. FBR's charismatic leader, Fadloli el-Muhir embodies these contradictions, being religious teacher and scholar, politician, presidential advisor, ethnic gang leader and vigilante. Gang members do vary, with some apparently motivated primarily by Islamic pietism, others more by an ethnic xenophobia, and others primarily by an overt concern for individual self-aggrandizement. But discussions with gang members move easily between the three themes without any sense of apparent contradiction or tension, as is evident in the following series of response from a group asked why they were involved in the FBR:

One (young gang member) simply rubbed his stomach and said "to fill my stomach". The others laughed but then responded more earnestly; "Yes, its true, most of us have only finished primary school, how else can we get by?" "My friends joined, so I did the same. We stick together". "FBR unifies us (unemployed young men) so that we can become a power". "It improves the welfare of the Betawi".³⁸

THE INTERTWINING OF PRAGMATISM AND IDEOLOGY

In order to explain this, and to examine the interplay between deprivation and dislocation as bases for gang violence, we need to revise the two characterizations of ethnicized violence that have been sketched, so as to reformulate the argument. The explanation is in two parts. Firstly, it is suggested that the perpetrators of violence have experienced a disillusionment with the state which has both a material and a moral dimension - a loss of faith in the state's ability to deliver economic patronage; and a loss of faith in its capacity to promote the development of the national community. Secondly, it is suggested that this dual disillusionment with the state generates a resentment mentality in which instrumental calculations of self-interest and ideological perceptions of communal rights, are reconciled.³⁹

The Indonesian government of Sukarno had sought legitimacy through its claim to embody a national unity forged through the anti-colonial struggle against Dutch and then Japanese rule. The Suharto regime had then legitimated itself through its overthrow of Sukarno, and then its capacity to provide political stability and economic development. Nevertheless, the apparent pragmatism of Suharto's New Order was modified by its portrayal of the national development project as progress towards a nation frequently idealized in civic, and indeed in democratic egalitarian, terms. To a significant extent therefore, the cohesion of the Indonesian nation-state became dependent upon ethnic and regional tensions being 'buffered' by the regime's attempts to sustain this belief in the possibility of civic nationalist progress. Whenever government policies and practices fell short of the civic nationalist ideals of equal citizenship, popular sovereignty and equitable economic development, Suharto sought to justify those policies and practices as the contemporary sacrifices necessary for Indonesia's eventual attainment of civic developmental goals. This civic buffer was never very strong however, and had to be repeatedly supplemented by inducements of patrimonial self-interests, and by the coercive constraints of authoritarian rule.

The violent, corrupt and exploitative behavior of the Suharto regime progressively undermined this civic nationalist faith in the Indonesian state⁴⁰, so that many Indonesians lost pride in Indonesian identity, and began to believe that the Indonesian state could never deliver peaceful progress. The removal of Suharto in 1998 saw a brief upsurge in civic optimism, - that the patrimonial inequalities and

inequities could now be replaced by the rule of law, by democracy, and by egalitarian citizenship. The reality, however, was that access to government patronage now became increasingly uncertain, with the result that elite rivalries intensified and aspiring elites began searching for new routes to access resources.

Disillusionment with the state thus can be seen to have had two sources; firstly, the reduced flow of state patronage to some sections of society; and secondly, the decline in faith in the state's capacity to promote the integration and development of the nation.

This dual disillusionment with the state was experienced by Betawi residents of Jakarta, as a perception that they were missing out on the urban development of Jakarta because of their marginalization from the main Javanese-focused patronage networks associated with the various arms of government; that there was an erosion of social cohesion at their local community level; and that this formed part of a wider decline in Indonesia's national integration. These perceptions contributed to a growing sense of isolation and abandonment, and thence to the search for new sources of resources, community, and authority.⁴¹ As Lake and Rothchild have noted, it is the loss of faith in a secure future - the fear that the state might fail to protect the ethnic community - which leads such groups to begin acting "as if the state were in fact weak."⁴²

If the government fulfilled its obligations and provided us with work, and satisfied our basic needs, then there would be no reason for FBR to exist. As it stands, if we don't stand up and fight for what is rightfully ours, we will end up with nothing.⁴³

THE 'RESSENTIMENT' RESPONSE

Feelings of marginalization do not necessarily generate violence. In order to examine the process whereby they might in some situations do so, we need to indicate in general terms how the resentment argument might be developed and applied

Marginalization may derive from cultural, economic or political origins, but it is experienced both in the material deprivation of the marginalized communities, and in the disruption of their authority structures. Thus the response of those who feel marginalized involves their attempt to make sense of the relationship between their economic deprivation and their loss of social cohesion. It has been suggested that, in

such circumstances, some activists in marginalized communities may begin to act on the basis of emotions which, while initially performing instrumentalist functions, can develop in less rational directions. To employ Hobbesean terminology, it is the intensity of anxiety about the future, and the ignorance about causes, which leads people to search for some source of good and evil - 'the gods were at first created by human fear,' In Roger Peterson's formulation, fear and hatred directed at the rectification of wrongs, can develop into a diffuse rage and thence into a resentment directed against an ethnic group which might not be the initial object of the fear and hatred, but which "can be most surely subordinated through violence".⁴⁴ This non-rational element is most dramatically indicated by the concept of resentment,⁴⁵ which provides a framework for the understanding of violence which combines rational and non-rational, instrumental and ideological, aspects. This intertwining can be initially sketched as a logic of identity-construction, before illustrating how some elements of it have been manifested in the case of the FBR.

(a) The colonial mentality:

A widespread first response amongst those who are marginalized, and are powerless to rectify this, is the development of what has been termed a 'colonial mentality'; the resignation of the marginalized, and the acceptance that their culture must be inferior. The corollary of this is the development of feelings of admiration and envy directed towards the culture of the dominant groups.⁴⁶

(b) The hatred of the exploiters:

Some amongst the marginalized minority come to perceive that their social disruption and feelings of relative deprivation derive, not from complex social forces, but from the oppression of the minority community by the state. Thus for example, even if the economic deprivation of a minority community derived primarily from the poverty of its economic resources, it is likely to be perceived by some ethnic minority elites as arising from the 'internal colonialist' functioning of the state.

(c) The illusion of the virtue of the victims:

The inability of the marginalized minority to act on this perception, and defeat the state, leads to a reformulation.⁴⁷ They experience a growing dissonance between traditional values and the egalitarian rhetoric of state nationalism; and also between

both of these and the social realities of their disruption and marginalization. One solution for this anomic dissonance is resentment. In the resentment process, shame of the 'defeated' culture of the minority, is replaced by its depiction as a virtuous culture characterized by purity, asceticism and communitarian spirit. By contrast, the envy of the dominant culture gives way to disdain, and its depiction as immoral - materialistic, decadent and corrupt. This resentment reformulation involves an element of illusion which enables those who are marginalized and deprived to once more feel good about themselves; "one can feel happy and superior to the poor individuals who possess the now devalued and ridiculed values" of the dominant culture.⁴⁸

The core evidence of the corruption of the dominant culture, and of the state, is of course, the contempt which the dominant culture displays for the minority culture, and thence the failure of the state to grant the minority cultural community its fair share of power and resources. It is important to note that this stereotyping of the dominant culture, and of the state, as corrupt by virtue of its disdain for the virtuous Us, carries with it the possibility of a reversal - that if a member of the dominant community, or of the state-elite, were to 'step outside' this stereotype and grant respect to the minority culture by recognizing its authenticity and validating its claims, then they might thereby move from the category of those to be disdained and opposed, into the category of those with whom alliance is possible. This means that shifts of political strategy on the part of the oppressed, which might appear either as pragmatic instrumentalism or as evidence of anomic instability, can be seen to exhibit an ideological consistency.

(d) The ethnic stereotyping of the Us:

The illusory reconstruction of the minority Us as a virtuous cultural community, takes the form of a thickening of ethnic identity which provides the 'victims' with a sense of moral and cognitive certainty, a sense of belonging, predictability and security. It is clear why it is ethnicity which tends to become the dominant focus for this absolutist collective stereotyping of the Us. The notion that the religious or linguistic group, within which many of ones' interactions occur, comprises a kinship community - a 'family' with its own ancestral homeland - offers security both by defining the traditional culture of the group as the culture of ancestral virtue, and also by evoking

the idea of an idealized past, of the ethnic Us secure in our own ancestral homeland, which has now been disrupted.

(e) The ethnic stereotyping of the Other:

This illusory reconstruction of the Us as virtuous ethnic victims, is always vulnerable to a revival of awareness that the culture of the Us is indeed inferior, characterized by its own materialism, decadence and corruption. The resentment ideology sustains the illusory sense of self-worth against such doubts, by displacing the negative attributes of the Us on to an ethnically stereotyped Other. This ideological strategy is particularly necessary for demarcating the Us from those others who are similar in their political marginalization and in their cultural attributes. In order to prevent the corrupt or materialist elements in their culture holding a mirror up to similar elements in the culture of the Us, they are constructed as the demonized opposite to the sanctified us. The portrayal of this Other as the ethnic enemy, and thence as the target of violence, means that the sense of impotence generated by the failure to confront the dominant state, can be replaced by a new sense of cultural and political potency, thus further promoting the sense of self-worth which resentment generates. The targeting of the marginalized Other is not simply an instrumentally rational attack against a vulnerable rival for resources; nor is it merely the irrational scapegoating of a weak but accessible innocent; rather it is an ideological ethnic stereotyping of those whose closeness in social position, physical proximity, and similarity of cultural attributes, most threatens the illusory sanctification of the Us. Once they are demonized as the threatening ethnic Other, their participation as rivals in the struggle for scarce resources can be portrayed as the invasion of the collective rights of the ethnic Us.

(f) The ethnic nationalist ideology of homeland invasion:

The complexities of politics thus become simplified, in the language of resentment ethnic nationalism, into a 'good Us versus evil Other' formula. The result is a powerful ethnic ideology offering a simple diagnosis for contemporary problems and a simple prescription for their resolution - 'Once we were cohesive and secure. Things went wrong when our homeland was infected or invaded by the Others who usurped our legitimate rights. If this usurpation can be rectified by restoring the autonomy of our ethnic homeland, then we will once again be cohesive and secure'.

Such a formulation becomes a self-validating cognitive and moral filter, since diverse contemporary grievances can be portrayed as arising from disruptive usurpations of the ethnic homeland by the demonized Other. This can be constantly validated by the exaggeration of the usurpations committed by the ethnic Other. The focus on the victimization of the community demonstrates to skeptical, apathetic or collaborationist elements, that there is no alternative to ethnic nationalist mobilization. The resentment process thus generates a similar “faulty reasoning and magnification of danger” to that outlined by Horowitz in his examination of the ‘calculus’ underlying ethnic riots.⁴⁹ The outline of this process in the case of the FBR indicates how it serves to resolve the disillusionment with the state.

THE RECONSTRUCTION AND SANCTIFICATION OF BETAWI ETHNIC IDENTITY

The Betawi are believed to have emerged out of the intermixing of various ethnic groups brought to Batavia, now Jakarta, from the 17th century onwards, to act as slaves, servants and soldiers for the Dutch colonial authorities.⁵⁰ Fearful that Javanese would conspire to revolt, the Dutch sought ethnic groups far from mainland Java, mainly from Bali, Ambon and the Moluccas, but also from other parts of South and Southeast Asia. The end of the slave trade and the abandonment of the Dutch policy of administering Batavia’s population along ethnic lines, resulted in greater intermixing. The resultant interactions amongst this marginalized and powerless section of Batavian society, led to the development of a distinctive ethnic culture which was self-consciously urban and egalitarian. Without the traditional aristocracy of the Sundanese, Balinese and Javanese, Betawi culture and society remains distinctly working class. The word Betawi itself has a colonial legacy, being derived from ‘Batavia’.

Their mixed ancestry, their migrant status, and their origins as a product of colonial rule, meant that the Betawi were initially not treated as ethnically authentic by Suharto’s ‘New Order’ regime, in its program of cultural engineering.⁵¹ Moreover, although the recent decentralization measures have seen indigenous populations gain access to local power, and to an improved standard of living, this has not been the case in the nation’s capital. The result has been the growing perception amongst the disillusioned Betawi that, in the words of Fadloli, “while Indonesia has

been independent for over 60 years, the Betawi have yet to experience independence in their own land”⁵²

Their experiences of marginalization in Jakarta, and their resentment responses to this marginalization, have led them to reconstruct Betawi identity so as to refute these ambiguities of ethnic authenticity, and to assert their cultural virtue. Individual gang members experience this as a shift from a low sense of self-worth to a new sense of esteem:

Before (joining FBR) people just considered us trouble-makers and no-one would give us jobs. Now we are respected in the community. People look up to us and come to us for help, whether it's a dispute or because they want to learn about Betawi custom.⁵³

What we have done since the end of the New Order is to lift up our heads, not stay stooped over or allow ourselves to be used politically. With the FBR we are taking pride in being Betawi and taking real steps to improve our conditions.⁵⁴

In order to make this transition, the gang members have redefined Betawi identity as an indigenous ethnic community residing in its own territorial homeland, rather than as migrants; they have identified ancestral heroes who embody the required Betawi virtues; and they have portrayed their working class culture of urban materialism and sensuality, as one characterized by religious asceticism.

The FBR deny the accusation that they are a preman gang, and assert the purity of Betawi culture in contrast to the corruption of the wider society.⁵⁵ They construct Betawi identity by employing the symbolism and mythology associated with cultural heroes such as the Robin Hood-like Si Pitung. Pitung is depicted as the quintessential jawara, both an outlaw and a figure of respect and influence amongst the community, who according to legend stole from the colonial and indigenous elite and distributed the spoils amongst the poor. While his actions were in the eyes of the authorities ‘criminal’ they were believed by the Betawi to be motivated by an unwavering pursuit of justice: martial prowess combined with religious knowledge and charismatic leadership.⁵⁶

The ethnic culture of the Betawi, which includes elements of secularity and sensuality typical of urban working-class societies, is reconstructed in FBR ideology, so as to be portrayed in terms of Quranic purity. FBR meetings juxtapose the display of Islamic piety with machismo and popular entertainment. Quranic recital is typically followed by performances of martial arts and highly risqué versions of *dangdut* where

members throw money at young female singers to gyrate or 'drill dance' (*ngebor*) in a sexually suggestive manner.⁵⁷ Similarly, the violent behavior of gang members is portrayed as a moralistic intolerance of the violence of others. In a recent speech, the FBR leader, Fadloli, said:

If they think that we are preman then it is clear that they do not understand the Betawi people.. it means they do not understand Betawi culture. ..It is clear that if we look around at all the disturbances going on in Jakarta, the preman involved are not Betawi... the FBR has been working to eliminate premanism for years, under the slogan 'those who are smartarses - smash em!'.... If an uneducated person makes claims about FBR then explain the facts to them, but if an educated person, a smart one, no need to answer with words, answer em with a smack in the chops.⁵⁸

Behavior considered morally offensive to Islam is attributed by the FBR to outsiders. Like other militant Islamic groups such as the Islamic Defenders Front, the FBR has engaged in vigilante actions, attacking and closing down bars, pubs, clubs, gambling dens and centers for prostitution on the grounds that they threaten the moral fabric of the Betawi community. Such assertions of moral outrage arise in the context of territorial disputes over protection rackets and in attempts to scare away non-Betawi from access to patronage. If a Betawi does indeed behave in an overtly criminal way, then this is depicted as alien to Betawi culture and to the FBR:

I admit that some of our members behave badly at times and do strange things, but that's no reason to slander the organization... The important thing is that up until now I have never seen an FBR member use his machete for criminal purposes. Have any of you seen FBR making bombs to terrorize foreign embassies? No!

It doesn't matter what accusations and slander are thrown against us as long as we stick to the Hadith and al-Quran⁵⁹

When Maduranese gangs and the FBR fought pitched street battles in the Cakung district of Jakarta in July 2002, over control of the street vendors and parking next to the Cilincing toll road, Fadloli was attacked, but managed to escape serious injury.⁶⁰ Stories soon spread of Fadloli's invulnerability to the blows from Maduranese machetes. For many this was interpreted as a sign that Fadloli had a God-ordained mandate to lead the Betawi. Like Si Pitung who survived numerous attempts by the Dutch to kill him, Fadloli had survived the attack of the new colonizers of Betawi

land. This story has proved a powerful recruiting tool, and in the months following Fadli's display of invulnerability. FBR membership increased rapidly.

The authentication of Betawi ethnic identity has also focused on the claim to homeland ownership of a bounded territory. The justification for FBR activism is primarily that the state has hitherto failed to recognize the virtuous Betawi as the rightful indigenous owners of Jakarta. An extract from a FBR leaflet states:

Oh Betawi sons and daughters, creating peace, tranquility and beauty in the Betawi land which has become the capital of Indonesia is our collective responsibility. Forgiving, always accommodating, not spiteful, prioritizing consensus, these are the characteristics of the Betawi. But, starting now, let's rise up and unite the Betawi people to resist the migrants who are rude, arrogant, self-interested, spiteful and don't respect and appreciate the Betawi indigenous people. We have had enough of sinfulness and barbarity, one drop of Betawi blood must be answered with an ocean of blood, and starting now let's make the Betawi jawara in Betawi land.

If we don't work to change things, our children will be silenced just as we have been. But if we struggle, if we knock down this system, then maybe, just maybe, in the future we will achieve our vision of Betawi as jawara in their own neighborhood⁶¹

The marginalization of the Betawi in Jakarta had engendered feelings of shame which were resolved by redefining the migrant community as the indigenous homeland community, by redefining the secular working class culture as the sacred ethno-religious culture, and by redefining individualistic aggression as the defense of the aggrieved community in pursuit of its righteous goals. But this resentment reformulation is only sustainable as reaction to perceived threats, which accordingly must be exaggerated.

THE TARGETING OF THE MADURANESE OTHER

Betawi identity has been constructed as the virtuous Us, defined reactively against the exaggerated threat posed by migrants. Javanese, the largest ethnic community (35%) in Jakarta, are identified by the Betawi primarily in non-ethnic terms, as 'Indonesian society', the state, the 'system', and in particular the 'New Order' whose corruption and criminality the Betawi accuse of having robbed them of their rightful resources and status. In a recent land dispute FBR leaders remarked that "all of this is a

consequence of the New Order government...the FBR is determined to take back our rights which were plundered by the New Order authorities”.⁶² However, it is the minority Maduranese community, comprising less than 1% of Jakarta’s population, who are the enemy against which the Betawi are mobilized.

The targeting of the Maduranese migrant minority by the FBR might be initially thought to derive merely from the pragmatic calculation that violence against the weak Maduranese might be more likely to succeed than violence against the dominant Javanese; or from an irrational scapegoating of visible minorities as the cathartic targets for a diffuse rage. However, the Maduranese became the targets of FBR violence because they appeared to Betawi residents as the visible usurpers of Betawi rights, moving into localities claimed as Betawi homeland territory, but refusing to accept the legitimacy of FBR control over that territory.

Both communities ostensibly share many common cultural elements, including nominal Islamic piety, a relatively egalitarian social structure, and a similar experience of being socially and politically marginalized. It should be noted that those migrants into Betawi neighborhoods, including Maduranese “who accept our values and way of life” and who recognize the legitimacy of FBR control, have been accepted into the FBR.

FBR violence is therefore directed not against all Maduranese, but against those who are resident in Betawi neighborhoods and appear to act like ‘preman’, both in their refusal to accept Betawi claims to the right of control over their homeland territory, and in their adherence to rival gangs. The demonized Maduranese are stereotyped as “migrants stealing or jobs and our land”.

The problem with the Maduranese is that they stick together in groups, are stubborn, and when they finish a (work) contract they refuse to go back to their home. Instead they just set-up in our neighborhoods, take our jobs, our land and bring all their relatives to live with them! If it wasn’t for us showing our swords they would just take over the place! ⁶³

It is not of course only the Maduranese who support rival gangs, but FBR has focused upon the threat posed by Maduranese since the 2002 tensions in Cakung, when both groups were claiming protection racket rights in the area. The FBR’s response was to explain this as not merely a turf war between rival gangs, a common occurrence in Jakarta, but as also a struggle for indigenous land rights.⁶⁴

Once territory had become constructed as the indigenous homeland, it became a symbolically important issue for the FBR. The group has a legal team specifically focused upon filing claims for tenure based upon traditional Betawi ownership. The lack of documentation coupled with the unverifiable genealogies has meant that they have had little success. However this has merely fueled the ideological claim that the Betawi continue to be colonized in their own land, and reinforced the view that the system is hostile to the Betawi, so that it is only through direct action that their rights will be recognized.

THE ‘STATE PROXY’ BASIS FOR VIOLENCE AND THE DUAL RELATIONSHIP WITH THE STATE

It is the control of the state by the corrupt and criminal elements in Indonesian society, which explains both the lack of Betawi access to patronage, and the civic nationalist failings of the state. The state has fallen into the hands of corrupt individuals who are the ‘real’ preman; “preman wearing ties, preman wearing uniforms, those in the executive or the legislature, in the police and army”.⁶⁵ So long as the Betawi felt themselves to be disempowered and marginalized, this depiction of the state implied that the FBR could direct their violence against state targets. However, the impact of the resentment illusion of Betawi virtue, and of the resultant belief in the FBR’s territorial rights over their ethnic homeland, has been to generate a new sense of empowerment amongst the FBR, which allows them to construct themselves as a proxy state for the Betawi homeland, willing, if asked, to ally with a weakened Indonesian state unable to function without FBR help. In this way, opposition to the state has become translated into alliance with the state. As one member explained, “If the government fulfilled its obligations and provided us with work, and satisfied our basic needs then there would be no reason for FBR to exist. As it stands, if we don’t stand up and fight for what is rightfully ours, we will end up with nothing”.

Horowitz notes in his discussion of ethnic riots, that such conflict is characterized by “a view of violence as intended to inflict punishment of group wrongdoing that government should have inflicted but has failed to inflict”.⁶⁶ If the state is corrupted so that it cannot perform its patronage and civic nationalist functions, then the virtuous Us have the moral obligation to perform the state proxy role, maintaining order, promoting justice, and generating patronage resources, at

least within the territory of our own homeland. In this state-proxy role, individual self-interested aggrandizement is justified as a compensatory right of the betrayed ethnic minority community. The state-proxy logic implies the convergence of instrumental self interests and collective Betawi rights, in the use of 'protection racket' violence.

The limited capacity of the Indonesian state to attain a monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force dates back to the late colonial period, and has been manifested both in the frequency with which army units have engaged in criminal activities, and also in the alliances between state agencies and criminal gangs which proliferated under Suharto's New Order regime.⁶⁷ During the late 1990s, however, the erosion of the state security apparatus led to the escalation of such alliances, aimed at "a system of shared power in the lower towns by splitting the territory up between the army, the police and the criminal world. Thus it brought about the delegation of some of the political surveillance mission to criminal urban gangs."⁶⁸ At the same time, some of the criminal gangs were seeking to legitimate their activities by making alliances with ethnolinguistic or ethnoreligious rights movements, resulting in gangs like the FBR. The concern of the state to ally with some gangs, thus coincided with the concern of some gangs to ally the state.

The FBR ideology constructs the Betawi as virtuous by reactively contrasting them with the corruption of Indonesian society, and specifically of the state elites who have oppressed them by using the state to benefit themselves, showing contempt for Betawi rights. But the relationship can change if some members of the state-elite show respect to the Betawi by offering to ally with them. The FBR can then willingly accept such an alliance, in order to restore the state to its rightful role as the defender of Betawi rights. This formulation means that the state is depicted in two ways in the FBR ideology- as the source of corruption and criminality which must be opposed; and as the source of authority which can confer security and respectability to the Betawi, and which thus can be allied with. FBR policies have sometimes combined both approaches, and thus give a pragmatic appearance to what has been in reality ideologically-driven.

In order to illustrate this interplay (rather than dichotomy) between pragmatic flexibility and ideological rigidity, the shifting relationship between the FBR leader, Fadloli, and the Javanese Governor of Jakarta, Sutiyoso, can be briefly outlined.⁶⁹ The FBR gained public notoriety when in March 2002, the group violently attacked a

demonstration organized by the Urban Poor Consortium (UPC). This Jakarta-based NGO protested against the forced removal of street vendors and launched a class action against Jakarta's administration for failing to adequately assist flood victims. The attack by the FBR led to speculation in the media that the FBR were paid by Sutiyoso, the Javanese Governor of Jakarta, to intimidate critics of the city's administration. The FBR's reason for the attack was that the UPC was supporting the claims of the Betawi's enemy, the Maduranese and other non-Betawi migrants resident in territory the FBR considered to be its own. Seven FBR members were arrested over the attack, but the FBR leader himself, Fadloli, could not be arrested without the approval of the President, given his membership of the Supreme Advisory Council (Dewan Pertimbangan Agung, or DPA). When President Megawati refused to agree to his arrest, despite his continued public threats against the UPC's leader, and despite a police request to investigate charges, it was widely assumed that Sutiyoso had protected Fadloli. This perhaps explains Fadloli's public support of Megawati in her 2004 Presidential election campaign.⁷⁰

In 2002, when Sutisoyo campaigned for re-election as Jakarta's Governor, the FBR gave him their support on the grounds that he "had demonstrated a concern for the Betawi people", for example by his closing of the Kramat Tungkek prostitution area, thereby cleaning Jakarta of the "immorality brought by migrants". This was despite the fact that several Betawi candidates, forwarded by Bamus, were also in the running for the governorship. Sutiyoso won the election, with Bamus's main candidate, Fauzi Bowo, being chosen as his deputy. However, Sutisoyo subsequently failed to reward the FBR for their support, rejecting their request for training facilities. Instead it was Fauzi Bowo, a fellow Betawi, who offered Fadloli the vacant deputy chairmanship of Bamus, a Betawi organization which he had previously rejected as too 'elitist'. Fadloli accepted, since the position would give him a platform from which to attack the Governor, Sutisoyo, and would give more credibility to his claim to represent Betawi.

This kind of political maneuvering is open to diverse interpretations. At first sight it seems like unprincipled self-interested pragmatism. Alternatively, it could be portrayed as indicating a linear shift from pragmatic political alliances across ethnic lines, towards a new ethnicization of political alignments. However, the FBR's quest for political advantage has been consistently based on one ideological formula; that the test of any potential ally, Javanese or Betawi (or even Maduranese), is their

willingness to give recognition to the FBR's right to control the Betawi homeland territory. Javanese (and Maduranese) are distrusted and disregarded until they grant such recognition; while fellow-Betawi are esteemed, so long as they grant such recognition.

THE SUCCESS OF THE STATE-PROXY STRATEGY

The success of the 'state-proxy' strategy is evident in the growth of FBR control over 'its' territory, its transformation from the status of delinquent preman gang to 'respectable' quasi-official status, and the increased willingness of the state to enter into an alliance with an FBR which now has more capacity to control this area of Jakarta, than do the state agencies. This is reflected in the change in the character of FBR violence, from 'thug' attacks to intimidatory 'displays of force'. The development of the FBR's alliance with the state is justified, for the Betawi, by the formulation that Betawi virtue will help the state free itself from the influence of corrupt preman.

In the space of a few years the FBR has been successful in establishing relatively monopolistic control over the informal economy in significant areas of Jakarta, most notably the semi-industrial sections of East Jakarta such as Pulo Gadung, its stronghold in Cakung, and Pasar Senen. Most racketeering gangs in Jakarta use coercive force and intimidation in order to secure money or resources on the pretext of offering 'protection' from a threat posed either by the gang themselves, or by their rivals.⁷¹ FBR's rationale for extracting regular payments from local businesses differs, since they argue that payment is their fundamental right, regardless of whether a 'service' such as protection is provided or not. The FBR claims exclusive economic and social rights as the representative of the indigenous community of Jakarta. Protection dues are considered legitimate taxes paid directly by business to the Betawi. The language used in an extortion letter sent to a local business is revealing:

With this letter we request the assistance of your business in providing a routine monthly donation to help cover FBR's operational costs. If you choose to disregard this request then we will assume that you do not care about the aspirations or welfare of the Betawi people as the indigenous population of Jakarta. This being the case, we, the Betawi Brotherhood Forum will do something to your business that is not in accord with your aspirations⁷²

Those reluctant to pay are labeled as outsiders antagonistic to the welfare of the Betawi community. The FBR also invokes a legal as well as a moral basis for pressuring businesses to employ their members, referring to Regional Regulation No.2 which states that businesses are obliged to offer work to local and indigenous people in the region in which they operate.

According to one FBR official:

the government has failed to either implement or enforce this regulation in Jakarta, as a result we have been forced to do so ourselves. We don't wish to take over the role of the police, but we have been left with no choice.⁷³

FBR's 2004 annual report lists as 'successes' businesses that have employed its members after being pressured. Those who refuse are picketed and systematically harassed. The ITC Cempaka Mas shopping mall had its entrance blockaded for several days after it turned down job applications from several FBR members. The long-term strategy of this approach, yet to be realized, is to create a situation where the number of FBR employees is sufficient that they can exercise a degree of control over the business. The major obstacle has been the fact that FBR members generally have low levels of education, meaning they are employed in the bottom tier of jobs, as security, cleaners or parking attendants.

Members also have access to other services that would otherwise be beyond their reach, including legal representation, ambulance services, subsidized health care, assistance in life-cycle rituals such as circumcisions, wedding and funerals, and a publishing house. The children of deceased members are adopted by Fadli and placed in his two orphanages. The FBR also has a rapid-response team, consisting of members highly trained in martial arts, who are on call to assist any members who get into trouble. Equipped with minivans complete with sirens and flashing lights, it is boasted that, traffic permitting, they can respond to a distress call with 30 minutes. Affiliation provides protection. A recent anti-preman campaign conducted throughout Jakarta by the police saw up to 500 members joining FBR each week. Membership alone was sufficient to avoid the police dragnet.

The organizational backbone of the FBR is its *gardu* structure of small security posts, usually situated near intersections, markets or bus terminals. Currently the FBR has approximately 185 *gardu* spread throughout the greater Jakarta region, with the highest concentration being in Cakung. Emulating the territorial command structure of the Indonesian military as well as the *pos siskamling* neighborhood surveillance

system setup by the New Order in the 1990's, individual gardu are coordinated by a district commander who in turn reports directly to FBR's central board.⁷⁴ Gardu are led by a coordinator and an advisory council, who are given a mandate by the central leadership to seek funds and take action against drug traffickers, alcohol vendors and entertainment venues considered immoral.

One of the main roles of the FBR therefore, has been to establish itself as a quasi-state in the traditional Betawi homeland areas of East and Central Jakarta. "We work with the police, army and government as long as it doesn't conflict with Sharia... We are ready to join together with the police and the army to eliminate preman".⁷⁵ This involves not just the policing of the area, but also the employment of state paraphernalia and symbolism- uniforms, sirens, motorcycle escorts:

Fadloli [FBR leader] announced he was leaving for another appointment. Members rushed forward to kiss his hand, forming a guard of honor as he moved to his black sedan, escorted by the 'general' (in pseudo military uniform with three general stars on his lapel, and reflective sunglasses) and his other personal security guard.... Two FBR motorbikes, imitation Harleys with police sirens attached, led Fadloli's motorcade, in the fashion of government ministers.... A lead bike stopped traffic. Cars that were slow to get out of the way were swiftly kicked and abused. The odd police officer in the street looked somewhat bemused, but certainly not concerned.⁷⁶

It is thus the state-proxy formulation, in the ideology of the FBR, which reconciles individualistic pragmatism and collectivist moral absolutism. If the state has failed to perform its legitimate role of giving all citizens an equal chance, and has betrayed the ethnic Us, then the ethnic Us must legitimately seek recompense for the injustices done to it. Each member of this victimized ethnic community has been discriminated against, so that any measures they take for individual self-aggrandizement, are merely just recompense for the collective injustice which has been done to the ethnic collectivity. It is this search for material benefits, perceived and depicted as ethnic rights, which generates most of the violence in which the FBR is involved. The fact that FBR has previously employed violence in order to attain dominance in its home territory, means, however, that 'shows of force' are now often sufficient to achieve the desired ends:

Seeing the approaching FBR mob (about 200 motorbikes), vendors at the market panicked, quickly grabbing what they could and running towards the park behind them. FBR yelled out that they weren't here to make a problem, and asked the vendors to go get the man who 'held' the market. It turned out this was a takeover bid...The FBR guys outlined what they wanted – to set up

a gardu at the market, to be paid as security, and for vendors to join FBR. In return they would ensure the area was 'safe', as well as deal with public order officers... While it had the outward appearance of a 'reasonable' discussion, the man was clearly highly nervous and was not in any real position to negotiate. The vendors stayed back inside their stalls, represented only by their man. He looked much outnumbered... He agreed, and soon after the FBR guys up and left, leaving behind a FBR flag, and clearly satisfied and buoyed by the ease with which they had claimed new turf. A public order van became an object of their sense of power, getting its rear vision mirrors ripped off and doors kicked in.⁷⁷

Criminal behaviour is thus experienced by gang members, as both legitimate policing and an assertion of Betawi indigenous rights. To the extent that the FBR consider that they have begun to achieve 'respectability' as a partner with the state, then they can begin to take pride in Indonesian civic nationalism. In August 2005 FBR was at the forefront of demonstrations against Malaysia over its territorial dispute with Indonesia regarding the sovereignty of Ambalat Island, situated off the east coast of Borneo.⁷⁸ In a speech at FBR headquarters after a demonstration Fadloli said provocatively "it's lucky that we do love Indonesia, because otherwise with our numbers we could really stir things up!"⁷⁹ The FBR has also demonstrated civic responsibility by volunteering to provide security for Jakarta's churches during the Christmas period of 2005-2006 when concerns were high regarding the possibility of terrorist attacks, though some commentators suggested that this was a strategic move to gain credibility amongst the affluent Chinese Christian community. This contrasted with their earlier involvement in the forced closing of several churches in Jakarta in 2002. Recently the FBR has aligned itself with conservative and hard-line Islamic groups via its outspoken public support of the proposed anti-pornography bill.⁸⁰ The FBR argues that the bill is crucial for protecting the moral fabric of not just the Betawi community, but also the nation.⁸¹

Our nationalist spirit is unquestioned, the territorial integrity of the republic of Indonesia is something we are prepared to die for.⁸²

CONCLUSION

Intra-state violence is sometimes depicted as arising from the pragmatic pursuit of self-interests by marginalized individuals, in situations where the state has failed to provide the kind of legal, social and political framework which successful capitalist development requires. The justification of such violence in the language of

ethnolinguistic, ethnoreligious or nationalist rights, is then portrayed as merely the hypocritical camouflaging for rational self-interests. Alternatively, such political violence can be understood as arising from the failure of the state to legitimate itself as the focal point of the moral community of the nation, so that anomic individuals seek recourse in morally absolutist commitments to ethnonationalist or ethnoreligious visions of community. Violence ensues from the emotive clash between such communitarian claims, which the fragmented state fails to reconcile. The tension between these two depictions of ethnicized violence rests on an acceptance of the dichotomy between the rational and the irrational. Even if we see that each strand of explanation can contribute partial illumination, this dichotomy means that the attempt to combine the two approaches might seem to generate not synthesis, but conceptual incoherence.

The dichotomy is challenged, however, by the resentment formulation. Resentment arises from an impulse to rationality, in that it derives from the attempt by those experiencing moral and cognitive confusion, to find a rational and internally consistent explanation for their marginalization, by locating the cause of their disempowerment in political oppression, depicting this as an injustice, and providing a route towards action and empowerment. Resentment achieves this by its simplification of social complexities, so as to identify one victim community, one agency of oppression, and one target for action. It is the element of illusion in this exaggeration and stereotyping which allows the logic of resentment to become the vehicle for the non-rational moral absolutisms – the sanctified Us versus the demonized Other- so as to resolve the emotions unleashed by anomie. Resentment thus has, at its core, a rational dimension, albeit one which is “partial and faulty”; it is motivated by the concern to restore a sense of self-worth, and to do so by constructing an argument which is internally consistent and which derives from a search for a “sense of fairness, justice [and] proper balance”⁸³. The gulf between the irrational and the rational is narrowed, albeit not fully bridged, by the resentment process.

Such an explanation of the consciousness of those who perpetrate ethnicized violence, in this case the Betawi Brotherhood Forum, corresponds with the explanation of the external factors which, in this particular case, engendered the resentment consciousness. The Hobbesian model of the strong state was one which provided a stable political framework so as to remove the physical and material insecurities and unpredictabilities which engendered violence; and which provided the

basis for the development of a sense of political community (the incipient nation) amongst those governed by, and having faith in, the state. It is this combination of material security and civic nationalist trust that is threatened by the fragmentation of the state. The loss of physical security and predictability in access to resources, and the loss of faith in progress towards the nationalist promise of civic equality, was not complete in post-1998 Indonesia, but it was sufficient to evoke a dual disillusionment in variously downwardly mobile groups- who experienced the fall of Suharto both as an increased uncertainty of access to material resources, and as an intensified exclusion from the brief euphoria of civic optimism. Ethnicized violence is only one possible response to such circumstances, and to the resentment they engender, since it requires resources and opportunities not available to all marginalized groups. Its explanation thus requires, as here, an interplay between the development of a conceptual framework, and the description of a specific case. The meeting of fanatics and criminals is contingent, but it is not incoherent.

NOTES

¹ The term 'ethnicized violence' is employed in order to avoid the assumption sometimes accompanying the term 'ethnic violence', that the violence is caused by ethnocultural differences between the participants. The term 'ethnicized violence' indicates both that the conflict is characterized to some degree by ethnic alignments, and that the participants have developed an ethnic consciousness of the self and the other. But the question of causation is left open, as a subject for investigation rather than assumption.

² Information on the Betawi Brotherhood Forum (*Forum Betawi Rempug*), has been accumulated by Ian Wilson through archival research and through three months fieldwork in Jakarta in 2003 and 2005. Interviews were conducted with FBR leaders and several dozen rank and file members, with the full-knowledge of FBR's leadership. Interviews were also conducted with FBR-affiliated groups and individuals. The researcher attended numerous FBR events, and spent time with members both 'on duty', and socially. Preman gangs vary between the purely criminal and the overtly political. The FBR was chosen, not because it is typical, but rather because it exemplifies the linking between criminality and ethnic rights claims which this paper seeks to explore.

³ See Timo Kivimaki & Ruben Thorning, 'Democratisation and Regional Power Sharing in Papua/Irian Jaya: Increased opportunities and decreased motivations for violence', *Asian Survey*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (2002), pp.651-672; Robert Cribb, 'From Total People's Defense to Massacre: Explaining Indonesian Military Violence in East Timor' in Freek Colombijn and J. Thomas Lindblad (eds) *Roots of violence in Indonesia: contemporary violence in historical perspective*, (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2002); Tim Kell, *The Roots of Acehnese Rebellion, 1989-1992*, (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995); Jamie S. Davidson, 'Communal Violence in Poso, Central Sulawesi: Where People Eat Fish and Fish Eat People', *Indonesia* No.72 (2001), pp.45-80; Jemma Purdey, *Anti-Chinese Violence in Indonesia, 1966-1999*, (Singapore: Select Books, 2006); Tim Lindsey, 'The Criminal State: *premanisme* and the New Order', in Grayson Lloyd & Shannon Smith (eds), *Indonesia Today: challenges of history*, (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2001)

⁴ For example, see Henk Schulte-Nordholt, 'A Genealogy of Violence', in Freek Colombijn and J. Thomas Lindblad (eds) *Roots of violence in Indonesia: contemporary violence in historical perspective*, (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2002)

⁵ Jerry van Klinken, 'Indonesia's New Ethnic Elites', in Henke Schulte-Nordholt and Abdullah Irwan, *Indonesia in Search of Transition*, (Pustaka Pelajar: Yogyakarta, 2002); Romain Bertrand, 'Behave like Enraged Lions: Civil Militias, the Army and the Criminalization of Politics in Indonesia', *Global Crime*, Vol. 6, No. 3-4 (2004) pp.325-344

⁶ Richard Robison and Vedi Hadiz, *Reorganising Power in Indonesia: The Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*, (London: Routledge, 2004)

⁷ George Aditjondro, 'Guns, pamphlets and handie-talkies: How the military exploited local ethno-religious tensions in Maluku to preserve their political and economic privileges', in Ingrid Wessel and Georgina Wimhofer (eds.) *Violence in Indonesia*, (Hamburg: Abera Verlag, 2001)

⁸ One exception is Peter Kreuzer, 'Applying theories of ethno-cultural conflict and conflict resolution to collective violence in Indonesia' in *Peace Research Institute Frankfurt Report No.63*, 2002, which examines theoretical approaches relating to the psychological, institutional and cultural dimensions of violence.

⁹ Yahya Sadowki, *The Myth of Global Chaos*, (Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1998), p.8

¹⁰ Vedi Hadiz, 'Decentralization and Democracy in Indonesia: A Critique of Neo-Institutionalist Perspectives', *Development and Change*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (2004) pp. 697-718

¹¹ Robison and Hadiz, 2004

¹² Stein Kristiansen, 'Violent youth groups in Indonesia: The cases of Yogyakarta and Nusa Tenggara Barat', *Sojourn*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (2003) pp.110-138

¹³ Bertrand, 2004

¹⁴ Greenfeld, 2005

¹⁵ Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, (London: Simon and Schuster, 1997), p. 76; see also Robert Kaplan, *The Coming Anarchy: Shattering the Dreams of the Post Cold War*, (London: Vintage, 2001)

¹⁶ Arief Budiman, Barbara Hatley & Damien Kingsbury (eds.), *Reformasi: Crisis and change in Indonesia*, (Clayton: Monash Asia Institute, 1999); Edward Aspinall, *Opposing Suharto: Compromise, Resistance, And Regime Change In Indonesia*, (Indiana: Stanford University Press, 2005); Kevin O'Rourke, *Reformasi: The Struggle for Power in Post-Soeharto Indonesia*, (New South Wales: Allen and Unwin, 2002)

¹⁷ Max Lane, 'Mass Politics and political change in Indonesia' in Budiman, Hatley & Kingsbury, 1999, pp. 247-8

¹⁸ Isaiah Berlin, 'The Bent Twig: On the rise of nationalism', in Henry Hardy, *I. Berlin, Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991)

¹⁹ Ruth McVey, 'Nation versus state in Indonesia' in Damien Kingsbury & Harry Aveling (eds.) *Autonomy and Disintegration in Indonesia*, (New York: Routledge, 2003), p.22-3

²⁰ Ian Douglas Wilson, 'Continuity and Change: The Changing Contours of Organized Violence in Post-New Order Indonesia', *Critical Asian Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (2006), pp. 265-297; Rudy Gunawan & Nezar Patria, *Premanisme Politik* (Political Thuggery), (Jakarta: Institut Studi Arus Informasi, 2000); Akuat Supriyanto, 'Paramilitary and Democracy: the mapping of paramilitary groups related to five major political parties in Indonesia' Research Paper for the Security & Democracy Lecture Series, National Democratic Institute of International Affairs, 2002

²¹ The term was habitually employed by New Order government spokesmen, defending state institutions from accusations of corruption or atrocity, by blaming such acts on individuals acting outside the command structure.

²² Henk Schulte-Nordholt, 'The Jago in the Shadow: crime and 'order' in the colonial state in Java', *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (1991) pp.74-92; Margreet Van Tillen, 'In Search of Si Pitung: The History of an Indonesian Legend', in *Bijdragen KITLV*, Vol. 152, No. 3 (1995) pp.461-482; Ian Wilson, 'The Politics of Inner Power: The Practice of Pencak Silat in West Java', PhD. Thesis, Murdoch University, 2002

²³ Originally derived from the Dutch word *vrijman* (freeman), 'preman' was used during the colonial period to refer to those freed from forced labor, or plantation slavery. In 17th century Batavia it meant one who was not in the service of the VOC (Dutch East India Company), but who nonetheless carried out business on their behalf. From the 1950s through to the 1970s the word took on the meaning of a police or military officer not on duty. By the early years of the New Order, 'preman' was used to refer to undercover agents – see Loren Ryter, 'Pemuda Pancasila: the last loyalist free men of Suharto's order?', *Indonesia*, No. 66 (1998). By the 1990s 'preman' had taken on the connotations of criminality and political thuggery it has today, no doubt due to the ambiguity that exists between criminality and state practice.

²⁴ Robert Cribb, *Gangsters and Revolutionaries: The Jakarta People's Militia and the Indonesian Revolution 1945-1949*, (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1991); Ryter, 1998

²⁵ Cribb, 2002

²⁶ Ryter, 1998

²⁷ *ibid*

²⁸ The dependence of the New Order on the presence of criminality is explored in James Siegal, *A New Criminal Type in Jakarta: Counter Revolution Today*, (London: Duke University Press, 1998)

²⁹ David Bouchier, 'Skeletons, vigilantes and the armed forces fall from grace' in Budiman, Hatley & Kingsbury, 1999; also John Pemberton, *On the Subject of "Java"*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994)

³⁰ Other gangs have pursued different agendas. The Islamic Defenders Front (*Front Pembela Islam* or FPI) is one example of a gang that has waged a vigilante style campaign to 'eliminate vice' but has also been accused of extortion and racketeering. See Wilson (2006) There has been little serious research done on youth gangs and militias in the post-New Order environment. Exceptions include Kristiansen, 2003; also Untung Widyanto 'Antara Jago dan Preman: Studi Tentang Habitus Premansime Pada Organisasi Forum Betawi Rempug FBR' (Between Jago and Preman: A Study on the Habits of the Preman in the Betawi Brotherhood Forum Organization), Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Indonesia, 2005

³¹ Maduranese are people originating from the island of Madura situated off the north-eastern tip of Java.

³² Born in Cakung in 1961, the son of a trader and religious teacher, Fadloli Muhr graduated from the famous Lirboyo pesantren in Kediri, East Java in 1986 after which he established the Ziyadatul Muhtadi'ien religious boarding school in Cakung, in 1990. He joined the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) before its split with Megawati in 1996, who forwarded him as a candidate for membership of the Supreme Advisory Council (DPA). In 1998 he was promoted to a presidential advisory body. In 1997 Fadloli established the Indonesian Santri Movement (Gerakan Santri Indonesia or GSI) a conservative anti-vice Islamic organization. In 2004 he ran, unsuccessfully for election as a member of the Regional Representative Council (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah or DPD).

³³ From the 2000 Indonesian census.

³⁴ 'Memperkenalkan Forum Betawi Rempug' (Introducing the Betawi Brotherhood Forum), Internal ms. Jakarta 2002. The FBR uses the English phrase 'real owner of the island'. Some of its other promotional material also uses English phrases, such as 'Fighting Spirit, Brave, Religious'.

³⁵ Other groups identifying as Betawi and often linked to the world of preman include Forkabi, Persatuan warga Betawi (PERWABI), Persatuan Orang Betawi (POB) and the Ikatan Keluarga Besar Tanah Abang (IKBT). Many of these organizations are affiliated with the umbrella organization the Betawi Consultative Body (*Badan Musyawarah Betawi*, or Bamus), currently led by Betawi vice governor Fauzi Bowo with Fadloli Muhr as his deputy.

³⁶ Interview with Fadloli el-Muher, Jakarta, 3 July 2003.

³⁷ The term jawara is employed by the FBR to distinguish themselves from criminal 'preman' gangs denoted as *Jago-an* (pseudo-jawara). According to Irawan Syafaie, a Betawi community leader, and former militia and gang member during the 1940s and 50s:

"Jawara were pillars of the community. If there was a disturbance or a robbery people would go to them rather than the police, and they would take care of it. They didn't drink or gamble, were devoutly religious and were protective of the community in which they lived. Jago-an on the other hand were like the preman of today, they stole, extorted and drank and gambled. People feared them, but didn't respect them." Interview with Irawan Syafaie, Jakarta, 30 August 2005. See also Wilson, 2002

³⁸ Field notes, Jakarta, 28 August 2005.

³⁹ The term 'ressentiment' derives from Nietzsche, and has been applied to the study of nationalism particularly in Liah Greenfeld, *Nationalism: Five roads to modernity*, (Cambridge: Harvard University

Press, 1992); Liah Greenfeld, 'Nationalism and the Mind', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol. 11, No. 3, (2005) pp.325-341 2005

⁴⁰ Benedict Anderson, 'Indonesian nationalism today and in the future', in *Indonesia*, No. 67 (1999), pp.1-12; also Ruth McVey, 2003

⁴¹ Susan Abeyasekere, (ed.) *From Batavia to Jakarta : Indonesia's capital 1930's to 1980's*, (Clayton: Monash University, 1985)

⁴² David Lake & Donald Rothchild, *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), p.8

⁴³ Interview with FBR official, Cakung., Jakarta, 3 September 2003.

⁴⁴ Roger Petersen, *Understanding Ethnic Violence: Fear, Hatred and Resentment in Twentieth Century Eastern Europe*, (Victoria: Cambridge University Press, 2002) p. 25

⁴⁵ On the diverse manifestations of resentment, see Greenfeld, 2005

⁴⁶ Octave Mannoni, *Prospero and Caliban: the psychology of colonization*, (Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1991)

⁴⁷ Those ethnic minorities occupying homeland territories on the periphery of the state, are more likely to believe that opposition to the state is feasible, in the form of ethnonational separatism. Under such circumstances, as in the case of Aceh, the interweaving of instrumental and ideological bases for ethnic nationalism take a different form; see David Brown, 'Why Independence: the instrumental and ideological dimensions of nationalism', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, Vol. 45, No. 3-4 (2004), pp.277-296

⁴⁸ Elizabeth Morelli, "Ressentiment and Rationality". Paper delivered at the 20th World Congress of Philosophy, [Massachusetts http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Anth/AnthMore.htm](http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Anth/AnthMore.htm), 1998

⁴⁹ Donald Horowitz, *The Deadly Ethnic Riot*, (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001), p.547

⁵⁰ Lance Castles, 'The Ethnic Profile of Djakarta, Indonesia', in Abeyasekere, 1985

⁵¹ *ibid*

⁵² Interview with Fadloli Muhiir, Jakarta, 26 August 2005.

⁵³ Interview with FBR member, Kebayoran, South Jakarta, 3 August 2005.

⁵⁴ Interview with FBR member, Cakung, East Jakarta, 23 February 2005.

⁵⁵ The FBR characterizes Betawi culture as centered upon the "three S's", silat, shalat and sekolah (martial arts, prayer, and school), that reflect the life of the *pesantren*, (Islamic boarding school) a pivotal institution in Betawi society. Interview with Fadloli el-Muhiir, Jakarta, 24 February 2005.

⁵⁶ van Tillen, 1995

⁵⁷ Susan J. Browne, 2000, *The Gender Implications Of Dangdut Kampungan: Indonesian 'low-class' popular music*, (Clayton: Monash Asia Institute, 2000)

⁵⁸ Speech given Fadloli el-Muhiir at the opening of a new FBR branch in Kebayoran, South Jakarta, 27 August 2005

⁵⁹ Fadloli el-Muhiir, speech in Kebayoran, Jakarta, 27 August 2005.

⁶⁰ A rival Betawi organization, the Communication Forum for Children of Betawi (*Forum Komunikasi Anak Betawi* or Forkabi) was also established in the wake of the killing of a Betawi street vendor by a Maduranese in 2001. The 'Kabi' of For-kabi is Betawi slang for 'smash', and the group was said to be like the FBR, a "front" through which to "deal with the problem of the Maduranese". Unlike the FBR its support base drew from several high ranking ex-military and a group of affluent Betawi from central Jakarta. Interview with Irawan Syafei, former Forkabi advisor, Jakarta, 30 August 2005.

⁶¹ FBR leaflet, 2002

⁶² FBR : Tanah Warga Betawi Dirampas Penguasa Orde Baru (FBR: Betawi Land has been Pillaged by the New Order), (28 September 2005), *Tempointeraktif.com*

⁶³ Interview with FBR official, Pasar Senen, Jakarta, 4 September 2005.

⁶⁴ *Tempo*, 'FBR Minta Polisi Amankan Wilayah Penggilingan' (The FBR Ask that the Police Secure the Penggilingan Area) 18 Juli 2002.

⁶⁵ Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Cakung, Jakarta, 24 August 2005.

⁶⁶ Horowitz, 2001

⁶⁷ Alfried Schulte-Bockholt, 'A Neo-Marxist Explanation of Organized Crime', *Critical Criminology*, No. 10 (2001), pp. 225-242. This argues that elite alliances with organized crime groups, gangs and vigilantes commonly transpire during crises of hegemony. In this respect Indonesia is by no means unique. For a comparative analysis of state-criminal alliances in Indonesia and Russia, see Ian Douglas Wilson, 'Vigilante Violence in Post-Authoritarian States: The Case of Indonesia and Russia'. Paper presented at 4th *International Symposium of the Journal Anthropology Indonesia*, Depok: University of Indonesia, 12–15 July 2005

⁶⁸ Bertrand, 2004

⁶⁹ This dual stance towards the state appeared at its apparently most unprincipled when Fadloli accepted donations from the Suharto family, while accusing the Suharto regime of embodying the corruption which had marginalized the Betawi. It should be noted however that knowledge of these donations was limited to a few FBR leaders, and that most FBR members were consistent in their opposition to the Suharto regime.

⁷⁰ *Liputan6.com*, 'Dukungan buat Mega-Hasyim di Silang Monas' (support for Mega-Hasyim at the national monument), <http://www.liputan6.com/fullnews/86181.html>, 16 September 2004. At an event hosted by the FBR as a display of public support for Megawati prior to the presidential elections, Fadloli glowingly declared that Megawati had "made improvements in every aspect of national life".

⁷¹ The Indonesian police and military operate in a similar fashion.

⁷² A copy of the letter is online at http://www.munindo.brd.de/milis/saran/saran_01/fbr.html

⁷³ Interview with FBR official, Cakung, East Jakarta, 22 August 2005.

⁷⁴ For more on the *siskamling* and neighborhood surveillance see Bertrand 2004; and Barker, 2001.

⁷⁵ Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, Cakung, East Jakarta, 26 August, 2005.

⁷⁶ Field notes, Jakarta, 28 August, 2005.

⁷⁷ Field notes, Jakarta, 27 August 2005.

⁷⁸ See for example, 'Seribuan Anggota FBR Demo Kedube Malaysia 30 Menit' (A thousand FBR Members Demonstrate at the Malaysian Embassy for 30 Minutes), (10 March 2005), *Detik.com*

⁷⁹ Field notes, Jakarta, 5 March 2005.

⁸⁰ Interview with Fadloli el-Muhir, 23 July 2006. In its support of the bill the FBR has aligned itself with a coalition of hard-line Muslim groups such as Hizbut Tahrir the Islamic Defenders Front, the Indonesian Mujahedeen Council (Majelis Mujahadeen Indonesia: MMI) and the government funded Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars (Majelis Ulama Indonesia: MUI)

⁸¹ If the bill becomes law, groups such as the FBR and the FPI will be strategically placed to take it upon themselves to enforce and police it, opening up new opportunities for both rent seeking and partnership with the state.

⁸² Field notes, Jakarta, 5 March 2005

⁸³ Morelli, 1998